

10. (Amended) The reflector as claimed in claim 7, wherein said coating extends over an entire circumference, but only over a part of a length of said reflector.

Please cancel claims 8, 9 and 11 without prejudice or disclaimer.

REMARKS

Claims 7, 10 and 12 are pending in the application. Claims 7 and 10 have been amended. Claims 8, 9 and 11 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The interview granted to Applicants' attorney on October 2, 2002 is appreciated. The Interview Summary dated October 2, 2002 indicates that the final Office Action restarted Applicants' statutory period for reply. Therefore, it is understood that the final Office Action of August 28, 2002 essentially withdrew the final Office Action dated April 12, 2002 and entered the Amendment Under Rule 116 dated August 7, 2002.

The Office Action rejects claims 7 through 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by either newly cited U.S. Patent No. 4,254,455 to Neal, Jr., hereafter Neal, or newly cited U.S. Patent No. 4,837,668 to Koehler, hereafter Koehler. These rejections are moot as to claims 8, 9 and 11, which have been canceled by this Amendment, and as to claim 13, which has been canceled by the Amendment dated December 26, 2001.

Claim 7 now recites a reflector that comprises the features of claims 7, 8, 9 and 11. Claim 7 now corresponds to originally filed claims 1 through 3 and 5 of the application.

The rejection of independent claim 7 as anticipated by Neal does not apply to present claim 7 because Neal lacks a feature recited by claim 7. Namely, Neal does not disclose or teach that the reflector has a coating of temperature resistant tenacious plastic. Neal's diffuser paint coating is not a temperature-resistant tenacious plastic, but rather is a paint coating that diffuses infrared and UV radiation passed by glass substrate 21 and is subject to peeling. In contrast, Applicants' temperature-resistant tenacious plastic coating has the tenacity to prevent the centrifugal ejection of particles of the reflector material due to an explosion of the light source. See page 3, lines 9 through 14, of the specification of the present application.

The rejection of independent claim 7 as anticipated by Koehler does not apply to claim 7 because Koehler lacks a feature recited by present claim 7. Namely, Koehler does not disclose or teach that the reflector Koehler's diffuser paint coating is not a temperature-resistant tenacious plastic, but rather is a paint coating that diffuses infrared and UV radiation passed by glass substrate 50 and is subject to peeling. In contrast, Applicants' temperature-resistant tenacious plastic coating has the tenacity to prevent the centrifugal ejection of particles of the reflector material due to an explosion of the light source. See page 3, lines 9 through 14, of the specification of the present application.

With respect to claim 10, neither Neal nor Koehler discloses a coating that extends over an entire circumference, but only over a part of a length of the reflector.

With respect to claim 12, neither Neal nor Koehler discloses a coating of the type recited in claim 7 and that is transparent towards light and/or heat.

For the reason set forth above, it is submitted that the above noted rejections of claims 7 through 12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by either

Neal or Koehler does not apply to claim 7 and to its dependent claims 10 and 12 and should be withdrawn.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and claims by the present amendment. The attachment is captioned "Version With Markings To Show Changes Made."

It is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth above that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be withdrawn, that claims 7, 10 and 12 be allowed and that this application be passed to issue.

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted the present claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and passed to issue. If this amendment is deemed to not place the application in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that it be entered for the purpose of appeal.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles N.J. Ruggiero
Reg. No. 28,468
Attorney for Applicants
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
One Landmark Square, 10th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
(203) 327-4500

Date: December 5, 2002

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

Application, Serial No. 09/729,675

IN THE CLAIMS

Please amend the claims as follows:

7. (Twice amended) A reflector for a high pressure gas discharge luminous body, said reflector comprising [a light reflective body] an interior surface and an exterior surface that is formed [of hard brittle material and that has a surface, and] by a heat- and/or light-shielding coating of temperature-resistant tenacious plastic [comprising] that consists of a fluoropolymer [on at least a portion of said surface].

10. (Amended) The reflector as claimed in claim 7, wherein said [portion] coating extends over an entire circumference, but only over a part of a length of said [body] reflector.